DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 820 PS 011 925

AUTHOR Popplewell, Frank; Winget, W. Gary
TITLE Systematic Parent Evaluation for Accountable Child Care: Development and Use of the Process with Family Day Care Homes.
INSTITUTION Ramsey County Child Care Council, Inc., St. Paul, Minn.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 36p.: Appendix B and C of this document are not available due to marginal legibility of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Early Childhood Education; *Family Day Care; *Identification; *Parent Attitudes; Parent Influence; Parent Teacher Cooperation; Prediction; *Program Improvement; Questionnaires; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Minnesota

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study were (1) to determine parents' levels of satisfaction with the care and nurturing their children receive in family day care homes; (2) to determine predictors of parent satisfaction with the homes; and (3) to determine the impact parent feedback has upon reinforcing strengths and correcting deficiencies in these homes. An evaluation questionnaire was sent to all parents (N=1183) who in the past 12 months had used or currently were using licensed family day care homes which were applying for license renewal. Four general kinds of information were requested from parents: minimal demographic information; objective ratings of the provider and facility; evaluation of a provider's skills relative to specific developmental age ranges; and enumeration of strong and/or weak points of the day care home. Analysis of the 536 completed forms returned revealed that parents were very satisfied with the providers, the facilities, and the caring behavior of the providers. Nine-two percent of the parents stated they would enroll/keep their children in day care and would recommend it to a friend. Predictors of parental satisfaction included the caregiver's recognition of a child's strengths and weaknesses, a day care home supplied with toys and materials, and the caregiver's efforts to ensure that the values they taught the children were consistent with the parents' values. Finally, the parent evaluations were found to strongly reinforce providers' strengths and only moderately correct providers' weaknesses. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED197820

SYSTEMATIC PARENT EVALUATION FOR ACCOUNTABLE CHILD CARE:

Development and Use of the Process

With Family Day Care Homes

PS 011925

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank Popplewell
+ W. Gary Winget

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Child Care Council of Ramsey County, Inc.
6 West 5th Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55102
July, 1980

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Development and use of the Systematic Parent Evaluation for Accountable Child Care (SPEACC) process was made possible because of the committment of the Ramsey County Community Human Services Department (formerly Welfare Department) to quality care in family day care homes. Equally important was the cooperation of parents and the support of the Family Day Care Association and family day care homes in the county.

A special thanks is in order for Shirley Kluznik, Supervisor of the County's Family Day Care Licensing Unit, and her licensing workers who participated in the study and follow-up evaluation process: Judy McCormick, Barbara Kellett, Michelle Miller, Jan Pederson, Sue Uhler, Barbara Street, Lois Anderson, Diane Phillippi and Rita Brown.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Problem to be Studied	1
The Setting for the Study	2
Need and Demand for Care	2
Family Day Care Homes	2
Ramsey County Community Human Services Department	2
Initiatives for Study	2
Assumptions	3
Definitions	3
Importance of Study	3
Description of the Study	4
Purpose	4
Objectives	4
Method	4
Related Studies	5
Results of the Study	6
Response and Demographic Characteristics	6
Level of Satisfaction	6
Predictors of Satisfaction	12
Impact of Parent-User Feedback	18
Discussion	22
Developments Since Termination of Study	22
Recommendations	22
Conclusions	23
Appendices	24
Appendix A: Parent Evaluation of Family Day Care Home Services (Long-Form)	24
Appendix B: SPEACC Profile Computer Program	27
Appendix C: Profile	34
Appendix D: Parent Evaluation of Family Day Care Home Services (Short-Form)	37

This study was conducted by Frank Popplewell, Research Assistant and W. Gary Winget, Executive Director of the Child Care Council of Ramsey County, Inc.

The Child Care Council (3-C), composed of parents, providers of services, and interested individuals and organizations, is a private, non-profit agency recognized by federal, state and local governmental units. Its goal is to assure that young children have the opportunity to grow and develop to their full potential. Funds for the preparation of the report were provided by Ramsey County, the Minnesota Child Care Facilities Act, the City of Saint Paul (C.E.T.A.), and private contributions.

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Average Provider Ratings	6
2.	Average Facility Ratings	7
3.	Quality of Infant Care	7
4.	Quality of Toddler Care	8
5.	Quality of Preschool Care	8
6.	Quality of Schoolage Care	8
7.	Comparison of Quality of Infant, Toddler and Preschool Care	9
8.	Supplemental Caring Information	9
9.	Most Important Factors in Selection of Home in National Ratings Vs. Perceived Strong Points of Homes in Ramsey County	10
10.	Enroll Child / Recommend Home	11
11.	Caregiver - Parent Communication	11
12.	Regression of Parent Satisfaction with Provider Characteristics	14
13.	Regression of Parent Satisfaction with Facility Characteristics	14
14.	Regression of Parent Satisfaction with Infant Care	15
15.	Regression of Parent Satisfaction with Toddler Care	15
16.	Regression of Parent Satisfaction with Preschool Care	16
17.	Regression of Parent Satisfaction with Schoolage Care	16
18.	Regression of Parent Satisfaction with General Questions	17
19.	Reinforce Strengths & Correct Deficiencies	18
20.	Built Into Relicensing Process as Part of Rule	19
21.	Reinforced Strengths & Corrected Weaknesses	20
22.	Summary of Providers	21

THE PROBLEM TO BE STUDIED

Assuring that licensed family day care homes meet minimal standards and provide quality care and nurturing for young children is a responsibility shared by providers, licensing agencies, and parent-users of the homes.

For too long, however, parents have been overlooked and unintentionally excluded from the formal processes designed to assure compliance with standards and quality care and nurturing. In fact, there has been a tendency for parents to assume that they don't have to be overly concerned with these issues because licensing guarantees that the homes meet standards and provide quality care and nurturing.

The problem addressed in this study is how to effectively involve parents in the formal processes designed to assure compliance and quality.

THE SETTING FOR THE STUDY

Need and Demand for Care

The need for child care has been increasing steadily over the past two decades due to the large-scale entry of women into the labor force. This increase in need as well as other social and economic changes (e.g., family mobility, two family wage earners) have resulted in an increased demand for formal or licensed child care services.

Family Day Care Homes

There are 950 licensed family day care homes in Ramsey County, Minnesota, in which the City of Saint Paul is located. At any given time, approximately two-thirds of these homes are actively providing or offering to provide care, and each year there is a 20 percent turnover in licensed homes.

These homes provide care for roughly 3,000 or 60 percent of the children in licensed facilities on an average day, and almost all infants and toddlers receiving licensed care are in such facilities.

An association of family day care homes supports and promotes quality care in homes through a variety of activities including a mini-grants program that assists homes in purchasing equipment and materials required to meet licensing standards or to enrich their programs.

Ramsey County Community Human Services Department

The County has been designated by the State as the agency responsible for administering the licensing of family day care homes. The licensing process includes checking references and agency records, a medical examination, a pre-license inspection of the home by a licensing worker and fire inspector, at least an annual visit to the home, spot checks and investigation of complaints, consultation and assistance, and a required minimum of six hours of in-service training for newly licensed providers. In order to provide additional support for licensed family day care homes and promote quality care and nurturing, the County initiated and funded Toys 'n Things, a comprehensive training and resource cneter which offers a wide variety of training options (e.g., in-home, classes, workshops), a toy-lending library, consultation, etc.

Initiatives for Study

The Child Care Council (3-C), in a 1974 working paper, proposed a series of changes intended to further the development of a systems approach to supplying child care services and subsidies. One of the paper's proposals was to improve the evaluation process by promoting professional as well as parent evaluations of services and communicating the findings of both professional and parent-user evaluations to the providers, licensing workers, funders, and others with an interest in the quality of care being provided.

When the Child Care Council initiated the first mini-grants program for family day care homes, it used parent evaluations to assess the quality of service provided by the homes receiving grants. The Family Day Care Association, which later assumed the program, continued the practice.

The County had used parent evaluations for some time in conjunction with the investigation of homes where licensing violations were suspected.

These agencies, the 3-C, Association and County, had a common interest in parent evaluations of child care services and in particular family day care homes. In 1977, they joined together and initiated this study, thereby continuing the evolution and growth of the child care system in Ramsey County.

Assumptions

Parents share the responsibility with providers and licensing agencies for assuring that licensed homes meet minimum standards and provides quality care and nurturing; however, parents must also be included in the formal evaluation process.

Parents decide the type of care they want, but are generally not informed about the standards which licensed family day care homes must meet; therefore, parents need to be informed of these standards as part of the evaluation process.

Parent evaluations are useful in reinforcing strengths and correcting deficiencies in the operation of homes; therefore, the feedback must be shared with providers, licensing workers, trainers, and others interested in family day care.

Parent evaluations must be integrated into the formal evaluation process in such a way that their feedback will be used; therefore, their feedback should be a part of the licensing renewal process.

Definitions

"Minimal standards" means the standards contained in Department of Public Welfare Rule #2 - - Standards for Family Day Care Homes and Group Family Day Care Homes (October, 1973).

"Quality care and nurturing" means, in an operational sense, care and nurturing which both meets the minimum standards and results in a high level of parent-user satisfaction with regard to specific provider, facility, and caring characteristics.

"Licensed family day care home" means a facility, usually a private dwelling unit, licensed by the State to care for up to five preschool children, including the providers own preschool children, as well as up to two part-time schoolage children for periods of less than 24 hours per day. A person caring for the children of only one family, for the children of relatives, for children less than 30 days per year, etc. is not required to be licensed. Group family day care homes, which can care for up to ten preschool children, are included in this definition for purposes of this study.

Importance of Study

Because the utilization of licensed family day care homes is increasing, it is essential that more attention be given to evaluation of the homes from the perspectives of the professional licensing workers and the providers as well as that of the parents. The strengths and weaknesses of the homes can be more accurately assessed when parents, who are the daily consumers of the homes' services, are involved in the formal evaluation process.

This study demonstrated that the Systematic Parent Evaluation for Accountable Child Care (SPEACC) process can be incorporated into the laws and regulations governing the licensing procedures for child care facilities, and it may serve as a guide to others interested in quality care and a systems approach to child care.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to demonstrate a practical and effective method for parent involvement in the evaluation of licensed family day care homes' compliance with minimum standards and provision of quality care and nurturing for young children.

Objectives

1. To determine parents' levels of satisfaction with the care and nurturing their children receive in homes.

2. To determine predictors of parent satisfaction with homes.

3. To determine the impact parent feedback had upon reinforcing strengths and correcting deficiencies in homes.

Method

Population

The population included in the study consisted of all parents who were using or who had within the previous twelve months used licensed family day care homes which were applying for renewal of their licenses in Ramsey County, Minnesota. Parents' names and addresses were taken from enrollment and termination forms which homes were required to submit to the County.

The study did not include every parent that used a family day care home. Those excluded from the study were first, parents who used a renewing home which did not report all enrolled children (an undetermined number of parents), second, parents who used a home not up for renewal during the study period, and third, parents who used non-renewing homes.

Duration

The study was conducted during a six month period from February through July, 1978.

Instrument

The questionaire sent to parents was designed both to inform them of what they should expect from a licensed home and to assess their level of satisfaction with the home. (See Appendix A.) The questionaire had been used in various forms over the preceding three years with selected groups of homes.

Four general kinds of information were requested from parents: minimal demographic information, such as how long a family had used a given home; objective ratings of the provider and facility, such as safety of outside play area; evaluation of a provider's skills relative to specific developmental age ranges, such as language development; and enumeration of strong and/or weak points of the day care home.

Data Collection Procedures

At the beginning of the third month prior to a home's renewal date, the questionaire and a stamped, return envelope were mailed to the parents using or who had used the home. Parents were requested to fill out the form and return it to the County's licensing worker. Before mailing the questionaire to the parents, the licensing worker wrote the

home's name and licensed capacity on the first page and his/her name on the last page.

Data Analysis

At the end of each month, information from returned questionaires was keypunched for computer analysis.

Average ratings were produced for each provider and summarized on a monthly basis. Initial attempts to utilize packaged computer programs for this purpose proved to be unwieldly. To better facilitate dissemination of parent feedback, a hybrid computer program (SPEACC Profile) was developed; this program was specifically oriented and suited to the purpose. (See Appendix B.) In cases where there were fewer than three responses per home, summaries were not produced in order to avoid the identification of specific parent responses.

The data for the county were summarized at the end of the study period.

Data Distribution and Use

The provider summaries or profiles were distributed to the licensing worker at the end of each month. After analyzing a provider's profile and the written comments on the individual questionaires, the licensing worker discussed the profile with the provider at the time of relicensing. A copy of the profile or "report card" was left with the provider. (See Appendix C.)

The county summary, which provided a general overview of the parents' perceptions of licensed family day care, were distributed to county, provider, and planning groups as well as used in this report.

Related Studies

The U. S. Department of Health Education and Welfare's 1975 National Childcare Consumer Study reports were consulted during the design of the final instrument and analysis stages. (See Table 9.)

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Response and Demographic Characteristics

Out of 1,183 evaluation forms which were distributed, 536 completed forms were returned. The monthly response rate varied from 25% to 60% with an average of 45%. Due to the volume of mailing which would have been required (relative to available staff time), individual follow-up of non-responding parents was not feasible. On the basis of observations made informally by licensing workers, it was concluded that the perceptions of non-responding parents could be presumed to be "not unlike" those of parents who did respond. While this conclusion seem appropriate, it has not been examined statistically due to the unavailability of data.

The respondents had the following demographic characteristics. Approximately half of the parents (263) had used their family day care homes for more than a year, while the rest (273) had used their day care homes for less than a year. (Sixty-four parents had used their home for less than four months.) Nearly three quarters of the parents who responded (384) were currently using the homes they evaluated, while the remainder (152) were former users of the homes. Of these 152 parents no longer using their homes, 52 left because they no longer needed care, 36 left because they moved from the area, and 37 had scheduling conflicts with their jobs or else had caregivers who left the business. The remaining 27 parents (out of the 152) who left their family day care homes did so because of specific dissatisfaction with some aspect of the services they received.

Level of Satisfaction

Provider Characteristics

The first item on the questionaire which allowed parents to rate their provider was Question 4. This item provided five important personal aspects of a day care provider and asked the parent to rate them on a five-point scale. On the scale: 1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = usually, 4 = always, and 5 = don't know. In this sample, there were a very few "don't knows" which were recoded with average item scores for the purpose of analysis.

Table 1

AVERAGE PROVIDER RATINGS

Did the caregiver:	mean	mode(n)	range
a. Show sensitivity to your child's feelings?	3.54	4 (310)	1-4
b. Listen to and talk with your child?	3.61	4 (338)	2-4
c. Hit, slap, or spank your child?	1.13	1 (406)	1-4
d. Discipline your child without being threatening?	3.37	4 (242)	1-4
e. Recognize your child's strengths and needs?	3.42	4 (250)	1-4

n = 521. Source: Question 4.

The average ratings portrayed in Table 1 are quite favorable, since these are some of the attributes of parenting which are considered to be integral to a child's social and emotional development. (With respect to item 4c, the reader should be aware that parents sometimes gave their caregivers permission to spank even though it was prohibited in the licensing rule.)

Facility Characteristics

Question 5 allowed parents to rate some important aspects of the provider's facility. Again: 1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = usually, 4 = always, and 5 = don't know. Here, also, "don't knows" were recoded with the average score for that item.

Table 2

AVERAGE FACILITY RATINGS

Was the home:	mean	mode (n)	range
a. Safe for ybur child?	3.82	4 (443)	1-4
b. Dirty and unreasonable cluttered?	1.11	1 (492)	1-4
c. Using a safe outside play area?	3.77	4 (394)	1-4
d. Supplied with books, toys, equipment?	3.82	4 (440)	1-4

n = 521. Source: Question 5.

Table 2 shows that facility ratings were quite positive for the county as a whole. It is especially noteworthy that day care facilities received ratings which were even higher than the provider ratings.

Caring Characteristics

Questions 6 through 9 allowed parents to rate caregiver behavior according to an objective rating scale similar to that used in Questions 4 and 5. These questions, however, differ in that they asked the parents to rate specific "caring" behaviors of the day care provider according to the age of the child for which care was provided. Sometimes different questions are asked for each of the groups: infant (0-15 months), toddler (16-30 months), preschool (2½-5 years), and schoolage (6 years and older).

Since parents did not have children in each of the age ranges, the number of respondents upon which these tables were based was less than 536. Here: 1 = very dissatisfied, 2 - dissatisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = satisfied, 5 = very satisfied, and 6 = don't know. In each of the items in Questions 6 - 9, "don't knows" (6's) were recoded with the average response for that item.

Table 3

QUALITY OF INFANT CARE

How satisfied are you that the caregiver:	mean	mode (n)	range
a. Held, rocked, cuddled, played with infant?	4.61	5 (108)	1-5
b. Talked, made sounds in response to babbling?	4.63	5 (103)	1-5
c. Allowed child to crawl, climb, attempt to walk?	4.71	5 (115)	1-5
d. Encouraged child to feel, taste, smell, listen, look?	4.60	5 (97)	1-5
e. Changed diapers as frequently as needed?	4.59	5 (103)	1-5
Average Infant Rating	4.62	-	-

n = 146. Source = Question 6.

Table 4

QUALITY OF TODDLER CARE

How satisfied are you that the caregiver:	mean	mode (n)	range
a. Encouraged positive social relationships?	4.66	5 (133)	2-5
b. Stimulated language development?	4.48	5 (99)	2-5
c. Provided large muscle activities?	4.45	5 (96)	2-5
d. Provided small muscle activities?	4.50	5 (102)	2-5
e. Stimulated creativity?	4.34	5 (85)	2-5
f. Supported emotional feelings?	4.46	5 (95)	1-5
g. Participated in toilet training as you wished?	4.55	5 (114)	1-5
Average Toddler Rating	4.49	-	-

N = 165. Source = Question 7.

Table 5

QUALITY OF PRESCHOOL CARE

How satisfied are you that the caregiver:	mean	mode (n)	range
a. Encouraged positive social relationships?	4.46	5 (135)	2-5
b. Stimulated language development?	4.38	5 (118)	2-5
c. Provided large muscle activities?	4.37	5 (108)	2-5
d. Provided small muscle activities?	4.34	5 (118)	2-5
e. Stimulated creativity and imagination?	4.33	5 (113)	2-5
f. Supported emotional feelings?	4.26	5 (103)	1-5
Average Preschool Rating	4.36	-	-

n = 240. Source = Question 8.

Table 6

QUALITY OF SCHOOLAGE CARE

How satisfied are you that the caregiver:	mean	mode (n)	range
a. Provided proper supervision?	4.39	5 (105)	1-5
b. Arranged recreational activities in home?	4.32	5 (93)	1-5
c. Cooperated in arranging neighborhood activities?	3.99	5 (51)	1-5
d. Provided place for and assistance with homework?	3.97	4 (47)	1-5
e. Encouraged positive social relationships?	4.46	5 (103)	1-5
f. Supported emotional feelings?	4.28	5 (80)	1-5
Average Schoolage Rating	4.27	-	-

n = 151. Source = Question 9.

As can be seen from inspection of Tables 3 - 6, most parents were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the care their children received. This clearly indicates that day care homes in the county provide a generally high level of quality care and nurturing.

On the other hand, as indicated by the lower ends of the ranges of response, parents were sometimes "dissatisfied" or even "very dissatisfied" with some aspect of their family day care home. In these individual cases, their evaluation forms provided an additional stimulus for specific providers to review their own caring practices.

Examination of Tables 3 through 6 also reveals that the average ratings of caregiver quality range from a high of 4.62 for infants to a low of 4.27 for schoolage.

Because the items for rating quality of schoolage care were substantially different than those of the other three age groups, statistical comparisons were made only among the infant, toddler, and preschooler scores. (Since the schoolage items were substantially different, the lower average rating of schoolage care might have been due to measurement error; to compare schoolage to the others might have been to compare apples to oranges.)

The items used to rate infant, toddler, and preschool care were not absolutely identical, but they were essentially comparable in that they sought to measure similar attributes (stimulation of creativity, socialization, etc.). Table 7 shows the statistical comparisons among these age ranges.

Table 7

COMPARISON OF QUALITY OF INFANT, TODDLER AND PRESCHOOL CARE

Age Group	Average Rating	n	Standard Deviation	t	Significance
Infant	4.62	146	.6646		
Toddler	4.49	165	.6807	1.37	NS
Preschool	4.36	240	.7058	3.01	.01

Source = Tables 3, 4, 5, 6.

As the above table indicates, the quality of care was not significantly lower for toddlers than it was for infants. The statistics do suggest, however, that preschool care quality was seen as being of significantly lower quality than that of infant care. Therefore, it would appear that parent-users of day care were, on the average, more please with the quality of care received by their infant children than they were by that of their preschool children. Lest any of this be taken out of context, it must be reiterated here that the average quality of preschool care was still exceptionally good with parents being between "satisfied" and "very satisfied" (4.36). To say that there is a significant difference between the two, then, simply means that parents using infant care are even closer to being "very satisfied" than parents using preschool care.

While the preceding items could be rated on a scaled format, other caring information proved to be more amenable to a "yes-no" format. Question 10-13 were such questions.

Table 8

SUPPLEMENTAL CARING INFORMATION

Was there a nutritious meal and two snacks each day?	95% Yes	5% No
Were children taken on outings -- walks, visits to zoo?	76% Yes	24% No
Was caregiver dependable -- temperament predictable, there each day?	99% Yes	1% No
Was caregiver helpful in teaching the values you wanted learned?	97% Yes	3% No

n = 419. Source = Questions 10, 11, 12, 13.

Providers' Strengths

Beyond the objective information gathered by the items which have been discussed thus far, open-ended Questions 17 - 19 allowed parents to supply subjective comments and/or criticism. While these were not incorporated in the individual home summaries, they were reported verbally by the licensing workers in supplying feedback to the provider.

For the purposes of the present county-wide analysis, however, the open-ended items were coded into one of 15 categories similar to those developed by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare in their 1975 National Childcare Study. This was done specifically so that Ramsey County parents' ranking of strong points in homes could be compared to the most important factors used by parents at the national level in selecting a home. The following table compares "most important" characteristics from the national study with perceived "strong points" by Ramsey County parents.

Table 9

MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS IN SELECTION OF HOME IN NATIONAL RATINGS VS. PERCEIVED STRONG POINTS IN HOMES IN RAMSEY COUNTY

Ramsey County Parents	United States Parents
1. Warm, loving provider	1. Reliable, dependable provider
2. Safe, clean home	2. Warm, loving provider
3. Personal attention for child	3. Safe, clean home
4. Other	4. Child likes this care
5. Reliable, dependable provider	5. Discipline given when needed
6. Home-like atmosphere	6. Experienced caregiver
7. Educational experiences	7. Good nutrition provided
8. Child likes this care	8. Constant supervision
9. Convenient location	9. Reasonable cost
10. Suitable home and equipment	10. Available when I need it
11. Others right age range	11. Home-like atmosphere
12. Planned group play	12. Convenient location
13. Discipline given when needed	13. Frequent information about child
14. Constant supervision	14. Suitable home and equipment
15. Reasonable cost	15. Personal attention for child

SOURCE: National Childcare Consumer Study: 1975, Volume III, American Consumer Attitudes and Opinions on Child Care, p. 4-18. Question 18.

It is interesting to note that there were both similarities and differences in the respective rankings of the two different parent samples. Ramsey County parents often perceived personal attention for their children (3) and the presence of educational experiences (7) as strengths; neither of these attributes appeared in the top 15 national desired characteristics. Conversely, national parents listed good nutrition (7) and discipline (5) at higher levels than those perceived by Ramsey County parents. It is important to realize that the absence of a characteristic from either list does not mean it was unimportant. It may have been an important factor which simply was not among the top 15 coded categories.

Providers' Weaknesses

The weak points of family day care homes were assessed by tabulating the responses of parents to Question 19. While 484 parents listed strong points of their home in Question 18, only 162 parents listed a weak point for Question 19. The weak point cited most often was that the home lacked suitable equipment and supplies (20 parents). Twelve parents each said their home was not safe and clean or that it lacked educational experiences, and 10 said their child did not get enough personal attention. The remaining weak points were specific parental complaints which did not fall into any of the 15 coded categories.

Enroll Child / Recommend Home

In order to indirectly address the question of parent satisfaction, three threshold questions were asked about enrolling/keeping the parent's child in the home and recommending the home to a friend.

Table 10

ENROLL CHILD / RECOMMEND HOME

Please indicate which of the following statements is most true:	n	%
I would enroll/keep my child in this home and recommend it to a friend.	481	92
I would enroll/keep my child in this home but not recommend it to a friend.	13	3
I would not use this home and I would not recommend it to a friend.	27	5

n = 521. Source = Question 16.

Again, parents indicated satisfaction with the homes by stating that they would both enroll/keep their child in the home as well as recommend it to a friend (92 percent). Some parents (8 percent) did indicate some degree of dissatisfaction with the homes, and their dissatisfaction cannot be ignored.

Caregiver - Parent Communication

While it is encouraging to note that most services are seen in such a positive light, it is also important that they remain in that light. For that to happen, it is important that there be cooperation and communication between parent and provider. Questions 14 - 15 helped illustrate the degree to which consistency and communication existed between the child's home and his or her family day care home.

Table 11

CAREGIVER - PARENT COMMUNICATION

How did you find out how your child was progressing in the home?	
a. Caregiver scheduled regular conferences	3%
b. Caregiver informed me most evenings	70%
c. Caregiver informed me from time to time	25%
d. Caregiver did not inform me	3%
Did caregiver keep you informed about what the children were doing?	95% Yes 5% No

n = 419. Source = Questions 14, 15.

The responses to these items suggest strongly that there is a high degree of understanding between parents and providers in the county. This is important because of the increased emphasis on the caregiver's accountability to the parent. Also, this communication can help both parent and caregiver alike to be more sensitive to the needs of the child.

Predictors of Satisfaction

While the central focus of the project was to analyze the information about child care quality which was provided by each individual item, a secondary goal was to determine which subset of items could provide the most efficient prediction of parent satisfaction.

To determine which items were the best predictors of parent satisfaction, multiple regression analysis was employed. Multiple regression begins by computing all possible correlations between a set of predictor items and a single criterion measure. It then statistically determines which combination of predictor items will make the most consistently accurate predictions about the criterion measure.

In evaluating family day care home services, the "real" predictor variables are the parenting behaviors of the provider as perceived by the parent and measured by the questions on evaluation forms. (These behaviors are the real predictor variables because they are what really shape the parents' attitudes about their day care homes.) For the purposes of this analysis, responses to Questions 4 through 15 were all treated as predictors of parent satisfaction.

The criterion measure for this analysis consisted of Question 16. Simply and straightforwardly, Question 16 asked parents if they would use and recommend a home; if they would use, but not recommend, a home; or if they would neither use nor recommend a home. This item was deemed to be a basic and face valid measure of satisfaction in that there were tangible, observable results to corroborate the responses to the item, e.g., the parent either continued to use the home or did not.

The second portion of Question 16, 16B, is a very peculiar category; parents who responded affirmatively to this item were saying that their day care home was good enough that they would continue to use it personally, but bad enough that they would not recommend it to a friend. Such a statement has several different interpretations possible: parents in this category, for the purposes of analysis, were considered to be well on their way to terminating the use of their day care homes.

Using Question 16 as a three-point (trichotomous) criterion measure, seven stepwise multiple regressions were performed to relate seven groupings of predictor variables to the criterion. These predictor variable groupings were: caregiver (4a-4e), facility (5a-5d), infant (6a-6e), toddler (7a-7g), preschooler (8a-8f), schoolage (9a-9f), and general (10-15). The results of the regression analyses for each of the seven variable groupings are contained in Tables 12 - 18.

A word of explanation is in order to aid in interpretation of the tables: by "Increase in Prediction" is meant the increase in the proportion of explained variation between the predictor variables and the criterion measure. This means that out of the total proportion of parent satisfaction (in terms of "recommend/not recommend") which can be explained by scores on a particular group of predictor variables, each variable contributes the percentage of this total which is indicated in the "Increase in Prediction" column. (Note to the technical-minded reader: the figures in this column represent the change in the squared multiple correlation coefficient after the variable was added to the equation.)

In other words, scores on Question 6a (Table 14) explained 41% of the variation in parent satisfaction which can be predicted by the entire group of infant Questions 6a-6e. Likewise, scores on 6b explain 3% of the variance which has not already been accounted for by scores on 6a. Scores on Questions 6e, 6c and 6d, however, do not significantly increase the ability to predict parent satisfaction, even though 6e, 6c and 6d all have "high" simple correlations with Question 16 (-.52, -.53, -.53, respectively). This is because regression analysis controls for the intercorrelation of the predictor variables; 6e, 6c and 6d are all correlated with 6a. Because of this, the variation in scores on Question 16 which could be predicted by 6e, 6c and 6d has already been accounted for by the variation in scores on 6a and 6b. To put it another way, any of Questions 6a-6e by themselves would be predictive of whether a parent would recommend the home or not -- but when all of the items are taken as a group, scores on 6a and 6b provide the best prediction of scores on item 16, and no further increase in information is obtained by adding 6e, 6c, and/or 6d to the prediction equation.

In specific terms, this means that the satisfaction (in terms of "recommend/not recommend") of parents with infant children could be most efficiently predicted by knowing how satisfied they were that the caregiver "held, rocked, cuddled, and played with their infant" (6a) and "talked, made sounds in response to babbling" (6b).

Conversely, knowing whether the caregiver "allowed the child to crawl . . ." (6c), "encouraged the child to feel, taste, smell . . ." (6d), or "changed diapers as needed . . ." (6e), while they would provide useful information in and of themselves, would not increase the ability to predict whether or not a parent would recommend the family day care home.

Table 12

REGRESSION OF PARENT SATISFACTION WITH PROVIDER CHARACTERISTICS

Variable	Increase in Prediction	Total Prediction	Significance	Multiple Correlation	Simple Correlation
*4e. Recognize your child's strengths and needs	26%	26%	.00	.51	-.51
*4b. Listen to and talk with your child	2%	28%	.00	.53	-.40
*4a. Show sensitivity to your child's feelings	1%	29%	.03	.53	-.42
4c. Hit, slap, or spank your child	-	29%	.80	.53	.05
4d. Discipline your child without being threatening	-	29%	.99	.53	-.11

n = 521. Source = Questions 16, 4a - 4e. Note: 4c predicts low satisfaction.

Table 13

REGRESSION OF PARENT SATISFACTION WITH FACILITY CHARACTERISTICS

Variable	Increase in Prediction	Total Prediction	Significance	Multiple Correlation	Simple Correlation
*5d. Supplied with materials, books, toys, and equipment	20%	20%	.00	.45	-.45
*5a. Safe for your child	8%	28%	.00	.52	-.40
*5b. Dirty and unreasonably cluttered	2%	30%	.00	.55	.29
5c. Using a safe outside play area	-	30%	.28	.55	-.28

n = 521. Source = Questions 16, 5a - 5d. Note: 5b predicts low satisfaction.

Table 14

REGRESSION OF PARENT SATISFACTION WITH INFANT CARE

Variable	Increase in Prediction	Total Prediction	Significance	Multiple Correlation	Simple Correlation
*6a. Held, rocked, cuddled, played with infant	41%	41%	.00	.64	-.64
*6b. Talked, made sounds in response to babbling	3%	44%	.01	.66	-.64
6e. Changed diapers as frequently as needed	-	44%	.23	.67	-.52
6c. Allowed child to crawl, climb, attempt to walk	-	44%	.65	.67	-.53
6d. Encouraged child to feel, taste, smell, listen, look	-	44%	.82	.67	-.53

n = 146. Source = Questions 16, 6a - 6e.

Table 15

REGRESSION OF PARENT SATISFACTION WITH TODDLER CARE

Variable	Increase in Prediction	Total Prediction	Significance	Multiple Correlation	Simple Correlation
*7f. Support emotional feelings	17%	17%	.00	.42	-.42
*7e. Stimulated creativity	6%	23%	.00	.48	-.41
7a. Encouraged pleasant social relationships	2%	25%	.07	.50	-.36
7d. Provided small muscle activities	1%	26%	.15	.51	-.38
7b. Stimulated language development	1%	27%	.19	.52	-.27
7c. Provided large muscle activities	-	27%	.56	.52	-.35
7g. Participated in toilet training as you wished	-	27%	.92	.52	-.16

n = 165. Source = Questions 16, 7a - 7g.

Table 16

REGRESSION OF PARENT SATISFACTION WITH PRESCHOOL CARE

Variable	Increase in Prediction	Total Prediction	Significance	Multiple Correlation	Simple Correlation
*8f. Supported emotional feelings	37%	37%	.00	.61	-.61
8b. Stimulated language development	1%	38%	.06	.61	-.34
8a. Encouraged positive social relationships	1%	39%	.06	.62	-.43
8d. Provided small muscle activities	-	39%	.39	.62	-.28
8c. Provided large muscle activities	-	39%	.30	.63	-.32
8e. Stimulated creativity and imagination	-	39%	.58	.63	-.37

n = 240. Source = Questions 16, 8a - 8f.

Table 17

REGRESSION OF PARENT SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOLAGE CARE

Variable	Increase in Prediction	Total Prediction	Significance	Multiple Correlation	Simple Correlation
*9a. Provide proper supervision	43%	43%	.00	.66	-.66
*9f. Support emotional feelings	3%	46%	.00	.68	-.55
*9d. Provide place for and assistance with homework	3%	49%	.01	.70	-.24
9c. Cooperate in arranging neighborhood activities	1%	50%	.18	.70	-.44
9e. Encourage positive social relationships	-	50%	.36	.71	-.53
9b. Arrange recreational activities in home	-	50%	.64	.74	-.47

n = 151. Source = Question 16, 9a - 9f.

Table 18

REGRESSION OF PARENT SATISFACTION WITH GENERAL QUESTIONS

Variable	Increase in Prediction	Total Prediction	Significance	Multiple Correlation	Simple Correlation
*13. Helpful in teaching values you wanted learned	55%	55%	.00	.74	.74
*15. Kept you informed about what the children were doing	3%	58%	.00	.76	.40
*10. Nutritious meals and two snacks each day	2%	60%	.00	.77	.26
*11. Children taken on outings	1%	61%	.01	.78	.27
12. Caregiver dependable - temperament predictable, there each day	-	61%	.26	.78	.18
14. How found out how child was progressing in the home	-	61%	.87	.78	.26

n = 419. Source = Questions 16, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

For each group of questions, the starred (*) items are those that significantly increase the ability to predict scores on item 16. Thus, if one were interested in focusing on only those questions which would be the best predictor of overall parent satisfaction, one would use only the starred items. If only one question was asked, the first item in each group could be used, since that is the item which correlates most highly with overall parent satisfaction (as measured by whether or not the parent would recommend the family day care home to a friend).

Based upon the above findings, the most important predictors of parent satisfaction with a family day care home are a home where the provider:

recognizes a child's strengths and weaknesses;
has a home supplied with materials, books, toys, etc.;
holds, rocks, cuddles and plays with infants;
supports the emotional feelings of toddlers and preschoolers;
provides supervision for schoolagers; and
helps parents in teaching the values they want learned.

Impact of Parent Feedback

The final objective of the study was to determine the impact parent feedback had upon reinforcing strengths and correcting deficiencies in the homes. This was, in a sense, the ultimate test of the use of parent evaluations.

As was indicated in the methods section in an earlier part of this report, returned parent questionaires were keypunched and computer summarized by homes, and these computer summaries or profiles were given to the provider by the licensing worker at the time of the relicensing visit. Written comments in the open ended questions were not summarized, although the worker shared these comments with the provider.

Licensing Workers' Assessment

In order to determine the impact, licensing workers who participated in the study as well as those who participated in the follow-up parent-user evaluation process were asked to assess the degree to which the impact-objective was achieved. The assessment was conducted 24 months after the end of the study period.

The licensing workers were asked the degree to which the parent-user feedback achieved the objective of reinforcing providers' strengths and correcting providers' deficiencies.

Table 19

REINFORCE STRENGTHS & CORRECT DEFICIENCIES

Degree to which licensing workers felt feedback achieved objective:	Study Period	Follow-up Period
High Degree.	25%	33%
Moderate Degree.	50%	33%
Somewhat.	25%	33%
None.	0%	0%
Don't Know.	0%	0%

n = 4 study period and 6 follow-up period. Source: Licensing Workers, Questions 1, 7.

The responses indicate that the licensing workers believe that the parent-user feedback did have an impact on reinforcing and correcting providers' practicies, but their responses varied as to the degree of impact.

In another question the licensing workers were asked whether or not the parent-user evaluations should be built into Department of Public Welfare Rule #2, the family day care home licensing rule, as part of the relicensing process.

Table 20

BUILT INTO RELICENSING PROCESS AS PART OF RULE

Degree to which licensing workers agreed:	Percent
Strongly Agree	0%
Agree	67%
Don't Have Preference	16%
Disagree	16%
Strongly Disagree	0%

n = 6. Source: Licensing Workers, Question 14.

The relicensing question was intended to indirectly address the impact question in Table 19 as well as other questions in a summary form. The response was split but definitely indicated a preference for continuing and institutionalizing the parent evaluation process.

In order to provide further information about the impact, licensing workers were requested to provide case examples. The following represent the types of situations where the parent-user feedback had an impact.

Case 1. The parent indicated that the provider provided no large muscle activities, but the provider actually had tumbling mats and a small gym set up in her basement which was used regularly. The parent-user feedback helped the provider realize that she needed to provide parents with more information about her program.

Case 2. The parent indicated that the provider did not regularly serve snacks and that she spanked children on occasion without the parents permission. The licensing worker and provider discussed these matters, and a statement was signed by the provider which quoted the appropriate sections of the licensing rule and stated that she agreed to comply with the rule. Since the agreement was signed, there have been no indications of skipping snacks or spanking. In general, the home received and continues to receive a very satisfactory rating from parents.

Case 3. The parents reported that the provider was lax in supervision and in insuring a safe place to play. The licensing worker had the same concern but no specific facts. A special visit was made by the licensing worker to discuss the problems and suggestions for improvement. As a result, the provider withdrew her request for an increase in her licensed capacity and requested help in developing a schedule of activities for the children. (Follow-up assistance continues to be provided.)

Case 4. The parent of an infant indicated "don't know" on several questions. At the end of the evaluation the parent wrote a note stating that she realized some of these were things that she should be discussing with the provider.

Case 5. The parent indicated that the provider spanked the child with the parent's permission. The licensing worker discussed this with the provider who thought that spanking was acceptable if the parent gave permission. The licensing worker had to clarify that the rule prohibits spanking regardless of whether or not permission is granted by the parent.

Case 6. The parent indicated that she was taking the child out of the home because she was dissatisfied with the care, but she did not want the licensing worker to tell the provider the reason because it may hurt the provider's feelings. The licensing worker plans to discuss the matter with the parent and hopes to relay the parent's concern to the provider in a constructive manner because the worker feels that other parents may have the same concern and it's affecting the providers's enrollment.

Case 7. The parent provided a positive evaluation of the provider. One month later the parent called the licensing worker and said that she felt the provider should not be licensed, relating to problems which occured prior to the positive evaluation. The licensing worker speculated that the parent would never have notified the worker about her true concerns had it not been for the parent-user evaluation form, even though it came back positive.

It's apparent that the most frequent low rating and negative responses result from poor communications between parent and provider (e.g., provider is using large muscle activities but the parent isn't aware) and between provider and licensing worker (e.g., provider didn't know spanking was prohibited even if the parent gave approval). These problems were quickly dealt with by providers and licensing workers. Negative responses relating to facilities were also easy to handle (e.g., cleanliness, animals). However, negative responses relating to behavior of the provider were more difficult to handle since parents and providers often disagreed and, even when there is agreement, it's difficult to confirm that the provider has actually changed his/her behavior. Also, what's unsatisfactory to one parent may be satisfactory to other parents in the home; this was often the case when negative parent-user responses were received.

In summary, the general feeling among licensing workers was that the parent-user evaluations were highly useful in reinforcing strengths (e.g., "it raised the providers' self-worth", "it had a snowball effect -- they got better and better"), but that it was only moderately useful in correcting deficiencies (e.g., parents tended to give the "correct" answer because they didn't want to hurt their providers' feelings). However, as one licensing worker said, "it's the best tool we have for evaluating the performance of a provider."

Family Day Care Provider Assessment

Family day care providers were also asked to assess the impact of the parent feedback process. Members of the Family Day Care Association's board of directors were mailed questionaires 24 months after the end of the study period and their responses are summarized below.

Table 21

REINFORCED STRENGTHS & CORRECTED WEAKNESSES

Degree to which providers felt feedback identified and reinforced/corrected	Strengths		Weaknesses	
	Study	Follow-up	Study	Follow-up
High Degree	33%	0%	0%	0%
Moderate Degree	33%	50%	0%	0%
Somewhat	16%	0%	0%	0%
None	16%	50%	0%	0%
No Strengths/Weaknesses Identified	0%	0%	100%	100%

n = 6 study period and 4 follow-up period. Source: Providers, Questions 3, 4, 5,10, 11, 12.

The above table indicates that providers viewed the parent feedback as positive and, at least during the study period, felt that the process helped reinforce their strengths. They did not perceive the feedback as being negative.

Providers expressed a strong liking for the parent feedback process with 50 percent indicating that they "very much" liked getting the feedback and 38 percent indicating that they "somewhat" liked the process. Twelve percent indicated that they "didn't care".

All of the providers indicated that they did not receive a computer-printed profile of the parent feedback. This was a surprise and two possible reasons can be given. one, there were fewer than three responses in any given month and, therefore, the computer did not summarize the responses; or two, the licensing workers did not show the computer-printed profile to the providers.

Two summary questions were asked of providers.

Table 22

SUMMARY OF PROVIDERS

Would you prefer that the results be given to you with a computer-printed summary?	Yes = 100%	No = 0%
Do you think that some form of parent feedback should be built into the licensing rule?	Yes - 50%	No = 38%

n = 8. Source: Providers, Questions 14, 15.

In summary, the providers felt that the feedback was very positive, liked receiving it, and wanted computer-printed summaries. Apparently the process had an impact with regard to reinforcing strengths. No provider felt that there were any weaknesses identified by parents. Half of the providers felt that some form of parent feedback should be incorporated into the licensing rule.

DISCUSSION

Developments Since Termination of Study Period

Following the study period, the Ramsey County Welfare Department continued the parent-user evaluations with the same questionaires and provider profile.

In early 1979, however, the computerized summaries or profiles of the responses were discontinued. There were several reasons for their discontinuance: some keypunch and analysis design problems had not been corrected, resulting in delayed and incomplete summaries; the contract for the staff position responsible for the analysis design and computer summaries had terminated; and licensing workers felt that some of the providers were intimidated by the computer form. The licensing workers, however, continued to either summarize the results by hand or allow the provider to look at the returned questionaires.

More than a year after the initial study began, it became apparents that the same questionaire should not be used on the second, third, etc. relicensing process with the same parent group. Also, some of the workers felt that the form was too long and that a shorter form would get a better response. Therefore, a short-form questionaire was tested in May and June of 1979. (See Appendix D.) The results were very mixed, with some licensing workers getting higher returns on the original, long-form (e.g., 54% vs. 46%) and other workers getting higher returns on the short-form (e.g., 53% vs. 33%). Overall, the return was 49 percent for the long-form and 56 percent for the short-form. By the end of the 24th month after termination of the study period, however, all the workers were using the short-form questionaire.

Recommendations

1. That two basic parent-user evaluation questionaires with provisions for optional questions be designed. A long-form questionaire should be designed to provide a structural framework within which parents can evaluate the family day care home in order to both inform parents about what they should expect from a licensed home as well as assess their level of satisfaction with the home. A short-form questionaire should be designed to ask the critical questions contained in the long-form and found to be predictors of satisfaction. Both forms should provide space for comments and space for inserting questions that can be changed from year to year in order to provide licensing workers with answers to timely questions as well as provide variety for parents that get forms in more than one year. The revised forms should reflect the new DPW Rule 2 provisions. The forms should be typeset and printed in order to improve their appearance and to make them easier to answer. Rationale: long and short-forms with space for optional questions will give licensing workers greater options yet allow for consistency on critical questions; and typeset and printed forms should improve the completeness and number of returns.

2. That keypunch and data summarization processes be streamlined. The questionaires should be designed for eash keypunching without the necessity for coding, except for open-ended questions. Procedures should be changed so that all responses for an individual provider are included in the home summaries; this will call for a change in the monthly batch processing procedure. The computer program should generate profiles even if only one parent's response was received, leaving the worker the option of giving or not giving the profile to the provider. Staff time should be specifically allocated to these processes to assure timely completion of home profiles. Rationale: streamlining the processes is necessary for the efficient and timely summarization of the information as well as necessary if the system is to be used.

3. That computer summaries be prepared by county each year and, at the option of the licensing worker, by home prior to relicensing. Rationale: county summaries can be used to identify trends and influence licensing, training, and other policy decisions; licensing workers should have the option of using computerized profiles for all homes or specific homes as they choose.

4. That parent information materials distributed by the County, Child Care Council, Family Day Care Association and others be coordinated with the evaluation questionaires. One of the purposes of the questionaire's design was to inform parents what they should expect from a home. Rationale: coordination of the questionaire with other information informing parents what they should expect from a home would tend to increase the effectiveness of the evaluation process.

5. That changes in the State licensing rule providing for parent-user evaluations as part of the relicensing process be advocated. Rationale: the experience in Ramsey County during the study period and following two years demonstrate that parent-user evaluations are useful and feasible as well as desireable.

6. That a similar parent evaluation process be implemented for centers. Rationale: the process has worked well with family day care homes and should be equally successful with centers.

Conclusions

Overall, parents were very satisfied with the quality of care and nurturing their children were receiving in licensed family day care homes in Ramsey County. They were satisfied with the providers, the facilities, and the caring behavior of the providers. They found their providers to be warm and loving people who provided a safe and clean home as well as personal attention for their child. Ninety-two percent of the parents would enroll/keep their child in their home and recommend it to a friend.

There were, however, some parents who were dissatisfied with certain aspects of the home while giving the home an overall high rating and a few who were dissatisfied with the home in general. For example, eight percent of the parents said they would not recommend the home to a friend. The most often cited weak point was lack of suitable equipment and supplies.

Several predictors of satisfaction were identifed, including recognition of a child's strengths and weaknesses, a home supplied with toys and materials, and helping parents in teaching the values the parents want learned.

The parent evaluations had an impact upon reinforcing providers' strengths and correcting providers' weaknesses. The impact was high in relation to reinforcing strengths and moderate in relation to correcting weaknesses. The most frequent low ratings resulted from poor parent-user and provider as well as provider and licensing worker communications.

It was demonstrated that the parent evaluation process was a practical and efficient method for involving parents in the evaluation of licensed family day care homes' compliance with minimum standards and provision of quality care and nurturing. In summary, "It's the best tool we have for evaluating the performance of a provider."

RAMSEY COUNTY WELFARE DEPARTMENT

APPENDIX A

PARENT EVALUATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOME SERVICES

The Ramsey County Welfare Department evaluates family day care homes for relicensing, and these homes are required to meet specific standards. The purpose of this questionnaire is to assist the Department in evaluating the home's application to have its license renewed.

Please fill out the questionnaire and return it to the address on the back. All parents receiving this questionnaire are either using or have used this home. This evaluation will be used directly in working with this home and in referring it for the care of other peoples children.

The _____ home is licensed for _____ preschool day care children and _____ schoolage day care children.

1. Do you have a child enrolled in the home now? (circle one) ---------- YES --- NO

2. How long did you use home? (check one)
   a. Less than 4 months ---------- ○
   b. 4 months - 12 months ---------- ○
   c. Over 1 year ---------- ○

3. How much time, on the average, did you spend in the home? (check one)
   a. Usually don't go into home ---------- ○
   b. Only drop off and pick up child ---------- ○
   c. Occasionally stop and talk ---------- ○
   d. Spend some time observing child in home ---------- ○

The following questions ask for your opinions about the personal characteristics of the caregiver and physical environment of the home.

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always	Don't Know
4. Did the caregiver: (circle response)					
a. Show sensitivity to your child's feelings?	N	S	U	A	?
b. Listen to and talk with your child?	N	S	U	A	?
c. Hit, slap or spank your child?	N	S	U	A	?
d. Discipline your child without being threatening?	N	S	U	A	?
e. Recognize your child's strengths and needs?	N	S	U	A	?
5. Was the home: (circle response)					
a. Safe for your child?	N	S	U	A	?
b. Dirty and unreasonably cluttered?	N	S	U	A	?
c. Using a safe outside play area?	N	S	U	A	?
d. Supplied with materials, books, toys and equipment?	N	S	U	A	?

- continued on next page -

The following questions ask about your satisfaction with the responsiveness of the caregiver to your child's/children's needs at certain ages. Skip those age periods that do not apply.

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know
6. Infants - 0 to 15 months. How satisfied are you that the caregiver: (circle response)						
a. Held, rocked, cuddled, played with infant?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
b. Talked to child, made sounds in response to babbling?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
c. Allowed child to crawl, climb, attempt to walk, explore outside crib?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
d. Encouraged child to feel, taste, smell, listen to, look at new objects?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
e. Changed diapers as frequently as needed?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
7. Toddlers - 16 to 30 months. How satisfied are you that the caregiver: (circle response)						
a. Encouraged pleasant social relationships -- playing near others?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
b. Stimulated language development -- rewarded child's efforts to use new words?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
c. Provided large muscle activities -- walking, climbing, running?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
d. Provided small muscle activities -- puzzles, beads?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
e. Stimulated creativity -- finger painting, singing, sandbox, pretend play?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
f. Supported emotional feelings -- helped child express, accept & learn to cope with feelings of sadness, joy?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
g. Participated in toilet training according to your wishes?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
8. Preschoolers - 2½ to 5 years. How satisfied are you that the caregiver: (circle response)						
a. Encouraged positive social relationships -- games, sharing, caring about others?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
b. Stimulated language development -- talking, listening?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
c. Provided large muscle activities -- climbing, skipping, jumping?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
d. Provided small muscle activities -- cutting, pasting, coloring?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
e. Stimulated creativity & imagination -- painting, playing house & store?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
f. Supported emotional feelings -- helped child express, accept and learn to cope with feelings of sadness, joy?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
9. Schoolage. How satisfied are you that the caregiver: (circle response)						
a. Provided proper supervision?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
b. Arranged recreational activities in home -- crafts, games?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
c. Cooperated in arranging neighborhood activities -- music lessons, scouting, gym?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
d. Provided place for and assistance with homework?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
e. Encouraged positive social relationships -- sharing, caring about others?	VD	D	N	S	VS	
f. Supported emotional feelings -- helped child express, accept and learn to cope with feelings of sadness, joy?	VD	D	N	S	VS	

- continued on next page -

1. Was there a nutritious meal and two snacks each day? (circle one) ---------- YES --- N
2. Were children taken on outings -- walks, visits to zoo? (circle one) ---------- YES --- N
3. Was caregiver dependable -- temperment predictable, there each day? (circle one) -- YES --- N
4. Was caregiver helpful in teaching the values you want your child to learn? (circle one) ---------- YES --- N
5. How did you find out how your child was progressing in the home? (check one or more)
   a. Caregiver scheduled regular conferences. ---------- ○
   b. Caregiver informed me most evenings. ---------- ○
   c. Caregiver informed me from time to time. ---------- ○
   d. Caregiver did not inform me. ---------- ○
6. Did caregiver keep you informed about what the children were doing? ---------- YES --- N
7. Which statements do you most agree with? (check only one)
   a. I would enroll/keep my child in this home and recommend it to a friend. ---------- ○
   b. I would enroll/keep my child in this home but not recommend it to a friend. ---------- ○
   c. I would not enroll/not keep my child in this home. ---------- ○
8. What three things do you most look for when selecting a home? (list)
   a. _____
   b. _____
   c. _____
9. What were the strong points of this home? (list)
   _____
   _____
   _____
10. What were the weak points of this home? (list)
   _____
   _____
   _____
11. If you are not currently using the home, what was the main reason you left? (check only one)
   a. Didn't need day care any longer. ---------- ○
   b. Moved. ---------- ○
   c. Other reasons. (specify) _____ ○

THANK YOU for filling out this evaluation.

PLEASE RETURN in the attached envelope to.

_____
Your Name

_____
Address Zip

_____
Telephone

Family Day Care Licensing Unit
160 E. Kellogg Blvd. 5 NE
St. Paul, MN. 55101
(Phone 298-_____)

DHS 4419 (Rev. 12-77)

APPENDIX D

PARENT EVALUATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOME SERVICES

RCW 1214
(6-79) Side 1

Licensed family day care homes are evaluated each year before relicensing. We find that parents who have used a home are the best judges of the care given to their own children. Thank you for taking five minutes of your time to fill out this form. Please return it to us today. This evaluation will be used directly in working with this home and in referring it for the care of other people's children.

The_____ home is licensed for ___ preschool day care children and ___ school age day care children.

1. Do you have a child enrolled in the home now (circle one) . . . . . Yes No

2. How long did you use the home? _____ _____

3. Is a nutritious meal as well as two snacks offered when your child is there for the full day? (circle one) . . . . . Yes No

4. Does the family seem to like your child? . . . . . Yes No

5. Are there recreational and learning activities in the home - crafts, games, story hour, creative play, singing, etc.? . . . . . Yes No

6. Are the children taken on outings - walks, visits to a park or zoo, etc.? . . . Yes No

7. Are the children properly supervised at all times? . . . . . Yes No

8. Do you feel you usually know how your child is getting along in the home? . . . Yes No

9. Is hitting, spanking or slapping used as a means of discipline? . . . . . Yes No

10. Is the home . . . . a. Safe for your child? . . . . . Yes No
    b. Dirty and unreasonably cluttered? . . . . . Yes No
    c. Using a safe outside play area . . . . . Yes No
    d. Supplied with plenty of materials, books, toys and equipment . . . . . Yes No

ANSWER QUESTIONS 11 THROUGH 14 AS THEY APPLY TO THE AGES OF YOUR CHILDREN

11. Is your infant held, rocked, cuddled and played with in the day care home? . . Yes No

12. Are diapers changed as frequently as needed? . . . . . Yes No

13. Does the provider cooperate in toilet training according to your wishes? . . . Yes No

14. Is it possible for your child to participate in after school activities such as scouting, gymnastics or music lessons, while enrolled in this home? Yes No

15. If you are no longer using this home, what was the main reason you left?_____

16. Please tell us what you would most like us to know about this home:_____

THANK YOU FOR FILLING OUT THIS EVALUATION!

Please return it in the attached envelope to:

_____ _____ 298-_____

Your Name

Family Day Care Licensing